App. F. IX-4

*Previous References*

Mug 172-32-1-B
150 35-1-2
34-1
15-26-1-1
5-20-1-6
280-28-1-4
269-28-1,4-6
335-08-1-2
94-30-1(1-2)
819-38-(2-6)

193 6.
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 44-36

Serial Nos. 1-2

*~~Letter References.~~*

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*Serial Nos.* 2

**Part B for** August 36

**SUBJECT.**

Additional honours claimed by Sri Purushottama Das Gupta at Katihar

8 2.

Do the Mug Comm
No 314 of 27-8-36

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29-8-36

Statistical & similar request made by Govt directly by the applicant which was negatived

G. R. S. APP F. III—1] 1936-7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mucz)

NOTES.

File No. 14-36

FILE HEADING.

Additional honours claimed by Sir Pattrick Mac at Delhi.

FROM

The Muzrai Commissioner

No. 1578/35-36 Dated 21.7.36. Received 21-7-36

| Diary No. 94 | Enclos. 1 | Spare copies — | Serial No. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Recommends that the use of licenses mentioned in the Compilation referred to there in works & the addition of Mena Magpie permitted for Sir Pattrick Mac, those asked for in excess of these being disallowed.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) In para 1 of the P. W. D. Secy no reference to a letter of 6th May 36 from the Agent of Sir Pattrick Mac at Delhi. A similar letter dated 5-5-36 had been sent here addressed to the Hon'ble Member of Council by the Secy to the Agent has accordingly informed on Tele. Endt No 1680 of 8/7/36 Tele. 1

x M. 150-35-4

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 0168J—GPB—5,000—3-5-29

Serial No.

additional bundles [illegible] to [illegible]

2) On a Recommendation of the M.C of 4.12.35, a Paladai as in favour of Sri no 910—19/ was issued 15-0-35 and 7.1.36 was also issued. Not being satisfied with these, the applicant has [illegible] of late petitioned the authorities for the Grant of more honours which there are no basis.

3) The M.C. has referred to a Compilation of bundles prepared when the late Mr C. Madakumbura the U.S. In Connection with the Grant of honours to Sri Chinnamahatmee; the M.C had based his recommendation on the Strength of the above said compilation of honours to Mudali. Regarding the genuineness of this Compilation, the following is an Abstract of minutes of the then first Member of council of 15/9/32 from para 18 of the Report in Min. 172-32 & pages thereafter.

× × × ×

The [illegible] Authority [illegible]

× Page 60 Sub 11

P W.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13 7 35

Claimed without investigation. x x x x

x x x x x

4) If the Secretariat were an authoritative one, the contents of the same could have been found in the Honours Manual printed in 1933. Passage note, of which mention is made in this new authoritative Compilation. As shown as it were issued in Numerals Matters Magani & Secretariat one of which is for the Procedure the P.W.D. Future Circulars if added the M.C. will be informed that ~~this~~ one a copy of the Ends of 5/6/36, will be sent to M.C. if there be informed that. No more grounds [illegible]

x Part two of the Compilation - Chapter-

x It Can this is a reference to a Part later than the one around the M.C. & the Office has no such Part]

5) The Surrangiah of the matter has been informed that no new honours can be granted. (Vide letter No. 1680 dated 5th June 1936). Attention is invited to para 13 of the notes in Secy. 135-35, Serials 3-4 on this question.

31-7-36.

No: Additional Inscription [illegible] Malabar

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 193 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

b) The Muzrai Comm[r] will if approved, be informed —

1) that a similar request made by the Agent direct to Govt has already been negatived;

2) that the Secretariat compilation referred to is not an authoritative document and cannot be acted upon without necessary investigation in each case, and

3) that it is not clear whether the Puttige Mutt of Kumvalli referred to in the compilation is identical with the Mutt of the same name at Udipi.

Gen. Secy)

dcg
31/7/36

M

It is in the file below - Inv

7) [illegible]

8) The suggn in para b above may be approved. It has been held previously that the Secretariat compilation of 1888 is not authority for allowing Honorary Northern Trustees and in this case non-hereditary [illegible]

GENERAL SECRETARIAT 31 JULY 1936 948

OFFICE OF THE HON'BLE MEMBER OF COUNCIL 12 O:AUG 1936

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WDC 41—GPE—30,000—18-7-35

Muz File No. 44 of 1936 General and Revenue Secretariat

D/o. Rec'd 25/8/36.

25.8.36. Issued 25/8/36

No 314 of 27.8.1936 to the Muzaffarnagar Commissioner 2

intimating among others that a similar report made direct to Government by the Agent of Sir Mutta has already been negatived—

B 28/8/36

31/8

Muz 44-36-1 6

M C 18.] C No. 1518 35.36

Encl. 1 (Five pages)

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

*Bangalore,...3rd..July.....1936.*

GEN. DEPT. 24 JUL 1936 MUZRAI

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
*Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.*

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
*Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,*
.....General.....*Department.*

GENERAL B 21 JULY 1936

SIR,

Claim of the Swamigalu of the Sri Puttige Mutt at Udipi for higher honors.

---

xP With reference to G.O.No.910-19/Muz.150-35-2 dated 7th January 1936 sanctioning this office proposals to grant a Rahadari to the Swamigalu for parading certain honors during his tour in the Mysore State, I have the honor to forward herewith petition dated 6th May 1936 received from the Agent of the Mutt praying that the order of Government may be reconsidered and that some of the Royal and Special birudus which have been disallowed may be permitted to be used for reasons explained.

2. Beyond the statements made in general terms, no documentary evidence in support of the claim has been produced, but it is stated that birudus higher than those now disallowed are being uninterruptedly enjoyed in British Indian Territories, and that the birudus themselves will be produced for being judged whether they were got prepared now to substantiate the claim of the Mutt or whether they belong to antiquity and have been in every day use. The Agent further submits that from certain papers available in the Mutt records it is seen that some references bearing on this question were given by the then Swamigalu to an officer of the Government in about the year 1836 or 1838. He, therefore, requests that the use of the birudus mentioned in the last para of the petition may be permitted.

3. On a reference to the Secretariat compilation of birudus enjoyed by Mutts prepared when the late Mr. C. Madiah was Under Secretary, a copy of which is available in this office, it is seen that the marginally noted birudus are mentioned against Puttige Mutt, Kuruvalli, Muttoor Magani.

1. Sweta Chatri
2. Makara Thorana
3. Gaggarikolu
4. Aftagiri
5. Gaggarigane
6. Palanquin
7. Ubhaya Chamara
8. Nagari
9. Danka
10. Ranakahale
11. Elephant
12. Horse
13. Camel
14. Silver Mace

In the Rahadari issued under the authority of the Government Order referred to above, all the birudus and the processional paraphernalia except Ranakahale have been disallowed. The birudus now asked for are in excess of those mentioned in the compilation in respect of the following:-

Suryavadya and Chandravadya Nishani
Cholu and Bharathamburi
Hagal Deevatige
M e n a.

4. In view of the further representation made by the Agent on behalf of the Swamigalu and of the fact that the compilation of the birudus makes specific mention of birudus enjoyed by this Mutt, I recommend that the use of the birudus mentioned in the compilation with the addition of Mena which is only a travelling convenience may be permitted, those asked for in excess of these being disallowed. On receipt of Government orders a revised Rahadari will be issued to the Mutt.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Luzrai Commissioner.

20.7.36

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 27th August 1936

No. 314 Muz 44-30-2 Enc. 5 pages

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. C. 1518/35-36, dated 3/21st July 1936 recommending the grant of additional insignia to the Swamigalu of Sri Puttige Mutt at Udipi, I am directed to state as follows:-

(1) A similar request made by the Agent of the Sri Mutt direct to Government has already been negatived in this office endorsement No. 1680/Muz. 150-35-4, dated 5th June 1936 addressed to him.

(2) It has been held previously that the Secretariat compilation referred to in your letter is no authority for allowing honours without investigation and that in this case no investigation is possible.

(3) It is not clear whether the Sri Puttige Mutt of Kuruvalli referred to in the Secretariat compilation is identical with the Mutt of the same name at Udipi.

The enclosures received with your letter under advertence are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

TRM.2

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

2 Copies

*Diary No. of letter replied to* ....94.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* 193 .

Date of issue 27-8-37

Signed by ...6 Subbaraya Iyer

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

Section Misc 3

File No. 44 — 36

Serial No. 2

No. 314 Sue five pages

To

The M. C.

Sir,

as follows :—

(2)—It has been held previously that—

authority for alienation hereunder
without investigation ~~and that~~ in this
case no investigation is possible

~~I am also to request you~~
(3) It is not clear
~~whether you would be good as to state for~~
~~information~~ whether Sri Pullige
Muni of Devanahalli kept in the
last compilation is the
same name as Boripi. The enclosures received
from you (Encl) under reference
are herewith returned.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully
2nd/8/36
for Secretary